



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

907 WRIT PETITION NO. 7839 OF 2025

Sangeeta Sumatikumar Marlecha

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Industrial Secretary And Others

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. G.J. Karne h/f R.S. Wathore

AGP for Respondents: Mr. R.S. Wani

Advocate for Respondent 2-7 : Mr. S.S.Dande

...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

Dated : November 27, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. Present petition has been filed for the following
reliefs :-

“C. The Respondent nos.2 to 4 may kindly be directed not to allot the Amenity plots no.72, 20, 21 and 63 situated at Waluj MIDC Area, Aurangabad in favour of respondent nos.8 to 11 till the final disposal of this writ petition.

Or

The Respondent nos.2 to 4 may kindly be directed to sanction any of the plot/Amenity plot/open space to the Respondent nos.8 to 11 for their project instead of Amenity no.72, 20, 21 and 63.

D. The respondent nos.2 to 4 may kindly be directed the proposal submitted by the petitioner may kindly be taken in consideration and sanction any amenity plot in favour of the petitioner for her project.”

2. We have heard Mr. Karne h/f Mr. Wathore, learned advocate for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is a businesswoman and she wants to establish a Blood Bank and Hospital on priority allotment. Petitioner states that she has filed her application/proposal in the year 2022 for Amenity no.72, 63, 20 and 21. It is stated that she has filed several applications for allotting the said Amenity plots for her project. Alongwith her application, she has filed DPR project report and building block plan. She has stated that, time and again she has filed her applications on 21.10.2022, 4.11.2022, 28.11.2022, 2.1.2023, 9.2.2023, 1.5.2023, 30.9.2024 and 11.10.2024 for the said amenity plots, however, the authorities have not considered the same. It is then stated that respondent nos.2 to 4 have scheduled the meeting on 20.9.2024 for sanctioning the Amenity plots, however, application filed by the petitioner was not considered. Now, those plots have been allotted to respondent nos.8 to 11; when, project of the petitioner is more useful than project of respondent nos.8 to 11. According to the petitioner, respondent nos.2 to 4 have deliberately not taken proposal of the petitioner in LAC meeting dated 20.9.2024 when in fact, she is demanding the same since 2022.

3. Learned advocate for the petitioner has taken us through the record and submits that, as the Website was not working properly, petitioner had submitted her applications physically with Respondent nos.2 to 4. It has not been considered, when in fact as per the regulations, even offline applications are required to be considered. Learned advocate for the petitioner also states that this Court in another matter has taken a view that even offline applications are allowed, he has not produced the said citation for our perusal.

4. Learned advocate Mr. Dande appears for respondent nos.2 to 7, waives notice for them and places on record photocopy of the office order dated 29.11.2017, wherein, it is stated that, as per the circular dated 26.9.2016 allotments of the plots would be done on online basis for the purpose of transparency and to achieve the Ease of doing business. According to respondent nos.2 to 7, offline applications are not allowed.

5. It appears from the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner that she is insisting upon the Amenity plots of which she has given the numbers only to be considered for her, for which she has given offline application. Now, if on a given

date the Website is not working or there is some technical problem, that does not estop her from filing the application online. It appears that thereafter she has stated to have given applications on several dates, but it is in the form of reminder. Perusal of the documents Exhibit 'A' collectively i.e. from page nos.13 or 22, it can be seen that these applications/reminders are given on the letter head of Shri Asian Nursing Home. They are signed by some different persons and the petitioner in her individual name has come before us. She has not disclosed as to what post she is holding with Shri. Asian Nursing Home. The proper application, which appears to have filed before respondent nos.2 to 7 for project report, the copy of that has not been submitted. With such deficiencies, we are not of the opinion that the matter can be entertained under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Petition stands **rejected**.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.) (SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)

...

AAA